

### REMARKS

In the parent application (Serial No. 09/796,750), claims 1-15 were originally presented, claims 16-26 were subsequently added in an amendment. After claims 21-26 were deemed allowable, Applicants cancelled claims 1-20 in the parent application. This continuation application attempts to overcome the rejections of record of claims 1-15 in the parent application.

The enclosed 68 sheets of formal drawings are identical to those filed in the parent application. No new subject matter has been added.

In the Final Office Action of the parent application (mailed May 1, 2003), claims 1-20 were rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-4, 14-15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilhem, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,846,730);
- Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilhem in view of Pryor (U.S. Patent No. 4,460,826);
- Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilhem in view of Holl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,458,350);
- Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilhem in view of Holl as applied to claims 6 and 10 above and further in view of Beyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,429,584);
- Claims 7, 9, 11, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilhem in view of Beyer; and
- Claims 12-13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilhem in view of Johnson et al.

To the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

New claims 16-35 presented in this continuation application generally correspond with claims 1-20 previously cancelled in the parent application. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Final Office Action dated May 1, 2003, the Examiner stated that Wilhelm teaches detection using conductive sensors and points to columns 7 and 8 of Wilhelm in support of this notion. While it does appear that Wilhelm utilizes conductive sensors, these sensors are not utilized in determining a position of the gripper arm of Wilhelm. The portions referred to by the Examiner merely state that the conductive sensor is used to detect a closed position of the grippers or that the grippers are in contact with the DSC cell. This is not the positional conductive detection contemplated by the instant application.

In addition, there is no reference in Wilhelm to any calibration being done in conjunction with the conductive sensors disclosed. In fact, Wilhelm specifically states “[a] separate sensing system for the position of the arm assembly utilizes optical sensors in conjunction with software for monitoring the vertical, horizontal, and rotational position of the arm assembly.” Wilhelm col. 3, lines 58-61, emphasis added. The portion of Wilhelm (col. 4, lines 58-61) referenced by the Examiner in regard to calibration refers to this optical sensing system, but does not include any conductive sensors. Accordingly Wilhelm cannot anticipate claim 16 as not all of the elements of the claim are present in the device of Wilhelm.

Regarding claims 31, 34 and 35, these claims also now specifically recite that the calibration is performed based on the position detected using both optical and conductive sensors. As stated above with respect to claim 16, Wilhelm teaches calibration based only on an optical sensing system. Further with respect to claim 34, Johnson does not provide the deficiencies present in the Wilhelm reference as described above and thus the combination of Wilhelm and Johnson does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.


SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703-770-7696

Date: December 9, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

CARNEY ET AL.

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Poh C. Chua  
Registration No. 44,615